



General Assembly

Distr.: General
16 July 2020

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Forty-fifth session

14 September–2 October 2020

Agenda items 2 and 8

Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles)

Report of the Secretary-General*

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 39/17 and contains information on the activities carried out from October 2018 to June 2020 by the Subcommittee on Accreditation of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in considering and reviewing applications of national human rights institutions for accreditation and reaccreditation.

* The annex to the present report is circulated as received, in the language of submission only.



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
II. Accreditation during the period under review	4
A. Session of October 2018	4
B. Session of March 2019.....	4
C. Session of October 2019	5
D. Session of March 2020.....	5
III. Amendments to the accreditation process	6
A. Amendments to the Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	6
B. Amendments to the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation	6
IV. Participation by institutions with A status in United Nations mechanisms and processes	7
V. Conclusions and recommendations	8
Annex	
Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	9

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to paragraph 14 of Human Rights Council resolution 39/17, in which the Secretary-General was requested to report to the Council, at its forty-fifth session, on the activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles).

2. In the Paris Principles, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 48/134 of 20 December 1993, set a number of criteria necessary for a national human rights body to be considered as a national human rights institution. Under those criteria, a national institution must be given a broad mandate to promote and protect human rights, clearly set forth in a constitutional or legislative text, and must be established in accordance with a procedure that affords all necessary guarantees to ensure pluralism of composition, independence and adequate funding.

3. The Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (hereinafter the Statute) mandates its Subcommittee on Accreditation to review and analyse applications for accreditation from national human rights institutions, and to determine whether the latter are compliant with the Paris Principles. In accordance with section 10 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee, the classifications for accreditation are the following:

- (a) A status, indicating full compliance with the Paris Principles;
- (b) B status, indicating partial compliance with the Paris Principles.

4. The Subcommittee issued its general observations with the substantive assistance and input of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). These general observations serve to interpret the Paris Principles and provide a basis for the Subcommittee's review of accreditation applications submitted by national human rights institutions. The general observations are also used by national human rights institutions to strengthen their capacity and efficiency, and to advocate measures by their authorities to improve the legislative basis of the institutions and to address any funding or other issues.

5. The Subcommittee is composed of four national human rights institution with A status. To ensure a fair balance of regional representation, section 3.1 of the Subcommittee's rules of procedure require that one institution be appointed as member from each of the four regional networks recognized in article 31.1 of the Statute (Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe). The members of the Subcommittee are appointed by their regional networks for a renewable three-year term. Under section 3.2 of its rules of procedure, the Subcommittee designates one of its members as its Chairperson. for a one-year term, renewable twice.

6. Article 6 of the Statute requires that its general and Bureau meetings and the meetings of the Subcommittee be held under the auspices of, and in cooperation with, OHCHR.

7. According to article 11.1 of the Statute, after considering a report from the Subcommittee, the Bureau of the Global Alliance takes a decision on all applications for accreditation under the auspices of, and in cooperation with, OHCHR. The latter therefore assumes the secretariat functions of the Global Alliance and the Subcommittee. This entails the analysis and preparation of accreditation files, and the presence of OHCHR at all meetings of the Subcommittee, including during deliberations and the adoption of reports, to oversee the process and provide technical advice to the members.

II. Accreditation during the period under review

8. During the period under review, the Subcommittee convened three times: from 15 to 19 October 2018, from 11 to 15 March 2019, and from 14 to 18 October 2019. The session scheduled to be held from 16 to 20 March 2020 was postponed owing to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic.

9. The annex shows the accreditation status granted to each institution at each of these sessions.

A. Session of October 2018

10. At the session of October 2018, the Subcommittee consisted of the national human rights institutions of Canada, France (Chairperson), Morocco and the Philippines. In accordance with section 3.1 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee, the national human rights institution of the Netherlands participated as alternate member for Europe to familiarize itself with the conduct of the accreditation process.

11. In accordance with article 15 of the Statute,¹ the Subcommittee reviewed the compliance with the Paris Principles of the national human rights institutions of Georgia, Rwanda and Timor-Leste. The Subcommittee recommended that all those institutions should be reaccredited with A status.

12. Pursuant to article 14.1 of the Statute,² the Subcommittee reviewed the national human rights institutions of Argentina, Denmark, Namibia and Zambia. The Subcommittee concluded that the institutions of Denmark, Namibia and Zambia should be reaccredited with A status, while it decided to defer again the review of the institution of Argentina to its second session of 2019.

13. Under article 16.2 of the Statute,³ the Subcommittee conducted a special review of the national human rights institutions of Chile and Ecuador, and recommended that the A status of the institution of Chile should be maintained. In accordance with article 14.1 of the Statute, it decided to defer the special review of the institution of Ecuador to its second session of 2019.

14. Under article 18.1 of the Statute,⁴ the Subcommittee reviewed the national human rights institution of Mauritania, which, in November 2017, had been given one year to establish its compliance with the Paris Principles. The Subcommittee recommended that it should be downgraded to B status.

B. Session of March 2019

15. At the session of March 2019, the Subcommittee was constituted of the national human rights institutions of Canada, France (Chairperson), Morocco and the Philippines. As the national human rights institution of France was reviewed at the session, the national human rights institution of the Netherlands served as the alternate member for Europe, under section 3.1 of the rules of procedure. The national human rights institution of Canada chaired the session in the place of that of France.

16. During the session, the Subcommittee considered applications for accreditation submitted by the national human rights institutions of Madagascar and Paraguay under article 10 of the Statute.⁵ The Subcommittee recommended that the institution of Madagascar should be accredited with A status and the institution of Paraguay with B status.

17. In accordance with article 15 of the Statute, the Subcommittee reviewed the reaccreditation of the national human rights institutions of Armenia, Bulgaria, Croatia,

1 Art. 15 provides that national human rights institutions with A status are subject to reaccreditation every five years.

2 Art. 14.1 provides that the Subcommittee may decide to defer an application to a later session.

3 Art. 16.2 of the Statute provides that the Chairperson of the Global Alliance or the Subcommittee may initiate a special review of the status of a national human rights institution where new circumstances may affect its compliance with the Paris Principles.

4 Art. 18.1 of the Statute provides that when the Subcommittee decides to downgrade an A status institution, the latter has the opportunity to provide in writing, within one year of receipt of such notice, the evidence deemed necessary to establish its continued conformity with the Paris Principles.

5 Art. 10 foresees that any national human rights institution seeking accreditation under the Paris Principles should apply to the Chairperson of the Global Alliance.

France, Ghana, Haiti and Nepal. The Subcommittee recommended that those institutions should be reaccredited with A status.

18. Under article 18.1 of the Statute, the Subcommittee reviewed the national human rights institution of Nicaragua, which, in May 2018, had been given one year to establish its compliance with the Paris Principles. The Subcommittee recommended that it should be downgraded to B status.

C. Session of October 2019

19. At the session of October 2019, the Subcommittee consisted of the national human rights institutions of Canada, France (Chairperson), Morocco and the Philippines. In accordance with section 3.1 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee, the national human rights institution of Guatemala participated as alternate member for the Americas to familiarize itself with the conduct of the accreditation process.

20. The Subcommittee reviewed, under article 15 of the Statute, the reaccreditation of the national human rights institutions of Afghanistan, Finland, Honduras, Hungary, Kenya, the Russian Federation, Togo and Ukraine. The Subcommittee recommended that all those institutions, except for that of Hungary, should be reaccredited with A status. It decided, under article 14.1 of the Statute, to defer the special review of the institution of Hungary to its second session of 2020.

21. Pursuant to article 14.1 of the Statute, the Subcommittee reviewed the national human rights institutions of Ecuador and Argentina.⁶ Under article 16.2 of the Statute, the Subcommittee recommended that the A status of the institution of Ecuador should be maintained.

22. In accordance with section 8.5 of its rules of procedure, the Subcommittee decided to seek policy guidance from the Bureau of the Global Alliance on the application by the national human rights institution of Argentina.

23. Under article 16.2 of the Statute, the Subcommittee decided to initiate a special review of the national human rights institution of Panama at its first session of 2020.

D. Session of March 2020

24. The Subcommittee agreed to postpone the session scheduled to be held in March 2020, until further notice, owing to the COVID-19 pandemic. New dates will be communicated to national human rights institutions in due time.

III. Amendments to the accreditation process

25. The Statute of the Global Alliance and the rules of procedures of the Subcommittee were amended in March 2019 to further improve the accreditation procedure.

A. Amendments to the Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

26. Article 14.1 of the Statute was amended to introduce a limit for deferral decisions. The deferral decision or decisions must now be limited to a period of two years, except in exceptional circumstances that may justify a longer period. In any event, the total duration of

⁶ The reaccreditation of the national human rights institution of Argentina had already been deferred on three occasions – in November 2016, in November 2017 and in October 2018 (see annex) – on the basis of the Subcommittee's concern that the position of Ombudsman had been vacant since 2009 and that, despite multiple attempts, an Ombudsman had not been appointed.

the deferral must not exceed the cycle set out in article 15, concerning periodic reaccreditation.

27. Article 18.3 was amended to align the deadlines and process for immediate suspension of accreditation in exceptional circumstances with those set out in article 12, relating to accreditation recommendation and challenge. Article 18.3 now provides that a national human rights institution may challenge a recommendation to suspend accreditation by submitting a letter addressed to the Chairperson of the Global Alliance, and copied to its secretariat, within 28 days of the date of communication of the recommendation. Any member of the Bureau of the Global Alliance that supports the challenge of the national human rights institution must, within 20 days, notify the Chairperson and the secretariat; if the challenge does not receive the support of at least one Bureau member within that period, the recommendation to suspend will be deemed accepted by the Bureau.

28. Article 18.3 further provides that if at least one member of the Bureau supports the challenge of the national human rights institution within the 20-day period, the secretariat of the Global Alliance will notify all Bureau members as soon as practicable, and will provide any additional relevant material. Any other member of the Bureau that supports the challenge of the national human rights institution must, within 20 days, notify the Chairperson and the secretariat of this support. If at least two Bureau members coming from no fewer than two regions support the challenge, the recommendation will be referred to the subsequent Bureau meeting for a decision. Otherwise, the recommendation to suspend the accreditation classification will be deemed approved by the Bureau.

29. Article 20 of the Statute was amended to remove the requirement for a national human rights institution to provide sufficient documentation, within 18 months of being placed under review, to establish its compliance with the Paris Principles. The article now provides that an accreditation status may lapse if a national human rights institution fails to submit an application for reaccreditation within one year of being suspended for failure to reapply.

B. Amendments to the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation

30. Section 6.5 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee was amended to introduce new deadlines regarding submission of documentation. It now indicates the dates by which the secretariat of the Global Alliance will invite national human rights institutions to provide their application and supporting documents to the secretariat of the Global Alliance. National human rights institutions scheduled for review at the Subcommittee's first session of a given calendar year will be contacted on or before 1 August of the preceding calendar year, and those scheduled for review at the second session of a given calendar year will be contacted on or before 1 April of that calendar year.

31. Section 6.5 further provides the dates by which, at the invitation of the secretariat, applications and supporting documentation must be provided to the secretariat. For national human rights institutions scheduled for review at the Subcommittee's first session of a given calendar year, documentation must be provided on or before 1 October of the preceding calendar year, and for those scheduled for review at the second session of a given calendar year, on or before 1 June of that calendar year. In exceptional circumstances, the Secretariat may decide to alter these dates after having consulted with members and observers.

32. Section 6.6 of the rules of procedure, relating to failure to comply with deadlines, was amended to modify the deadline for submitting an application for reaccreditation. It now indicates that if a national human rights institution fails to submit an application for reaccreditation within six months of receiving notice, its accreditation status may be suspended or may lapse in accordance with article 19 of the Statute.

33. Section 6.7 of the rules of procedure, relating to submissions from third parties, was amended to introduce new deadlines. It now indicates that for national human rights institutions scheduled for review at the Subcommittee's first session of a given calendar year, third-party submissions must be received by the secretariat on or before 1 October of the preceding calendar year, and for those scheduled for review at the second session of a given

calendar year, on or before 1 June of that calendar year. The provision further indicates that the dates for the relevant session of the Subcommittee will be set for no earlier than four months from the deadline for receipt of relevant information and documentation, and that in exceptional circumstances, the secretariat may decide to alter these dates after having consulted with members and observers.

IV. Participation by institutions with A status in United Nations mechanisms and processes

34. The Human Rights Council and the General Assembly, in their respective resolutions 16/21 and 65/281 on reviewing the work and functioning of the Human Rights Council, have granted increased opportunities and visibility to national human rights institutions with A status. In particular, under the universal periodic review, stakeholders' reports contain a separate section dedicated to contributions by such institutions. Moreover, during the review of a Member State, institutions with A status are entitled to intervene immediately after the presentation of that State during the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council plenary. Institutions with A status are also able to intervene immediately after the State concerned, during the interactive dialogue between the Human Rights Council and special procedure mandate holders, following their presentation of their country mission reports. Furthermore, institutions with A status may nominate candidates for special procedure mandates.

35. In its resolution 39/17, the Human Rights Council encourages all relevant United Nations mechanisms and processes, including those related to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its high-level political forum, to strengthen the independent participation of national human rights institutions compliant with the Paris Principles, in accordance with their respective mandates. Furthermore, under Sustainable Development Goal 16 – to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels – indicator 16.a.1 of the global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 71/313, annex) refers to the existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles.

36. Following up on these provisions, in March 2019, the Commission on the Status of Women encouraged its secretariat to continue its consideration of the enhanced participation of national human rights institutions with A status. Similarly, in April 2019, the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing invited national human rights institutions fully compliant with the Paris Principles to contribute to its tenth session. In June 2019, national human rights institutions were accredited to the Conference of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Institutions with A status were also invited to contribute at all stages to the Peoples' Summit on Climate, Rights and Human Survival, in September 2019, and during side events at the twenty-fifth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, in December 2019.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

37. **The Paris Principles and the Subcommittee's general observations remain the basis upon which the Subcommittee accredits national human rights institutions.**

38. **The interdependence and indivisibility of human rights require that the mandate of national human rights institutions be broad, as set out in the Paris Principles, to include the promotion and protection of all human rights – civil, political, economic, social and cultural – for everyone.**

39. **The abolition in 2015 of the C status accreditation classification (non-compliance with the Paris Principles) does not imply that all institutions reviewed for accreditation should be granted at least B status (partial compliance with the Paris Principles), as this would undermine the credibility of the accreditation process. Those institutions that do**

not meet the criteria for either full or partial compliance with the Paris Principles remain unaccredited.

40. Members of the Subcommittee participate in its work as impartial, objective and independent experts, without taking into account national, regional and/or political considerations, as required by the rules of procedure.

41. Representatives of the Global Alliance and its regional networks attend the sessions of the Subcommittee as observers. They should neither advocate a particular accreditation classification nor participate in the Subcommittee members' decision-making.

42. To ensure the credibility of the accreditation process, regional networks of national human rights institutions are urged to appoint, as members of the Subcommittee, national human rights institutions with a proven commitment to the Paris Principles and with a full understanding of the benefits and responsibilities that the accreditation status brings to national human rights institutions with regard to their participation in the international human rights system.

43. The substantive and advisory role of OHCHR as the secretariat for the Subcommittee enhances the credibility of the accreditation process. The presence of OHCHR during the decision-making process is instrumental in attesting to the compliance of this process with the established rules of procedure, and contributes to its transparency, impartiality, fairness and rigour.

44. All communications between the Subcommittee and national human rights institutions should be channelled through OHCHR, as the secretariat of the Subcommittee, in order to ensure compliance and consistency with the Subcommittee's rules of procedure.

45. Member States are called upon to ensure achievement of indicator 16.a.1 of the global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which refers to the existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles. In this regard, Member States are invited to seek the assistance of OHCHR when drafting the founding laws of national human rights institutions.

46. National human rights institutions are urged to engage in technical cooperation programmes with OHCHR to ensure that they discharge their mandates in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

47. Member States and other stakeholders are encouraged to enable OHCHR, through financial support, to maintain its high-quality servicing of the Subcommittee.

Annex

Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

Accreditation status as of 27 November 2019

In accordance with the Paris Principles and the Rules of Procedure of the Subcommittee, the classifications for accreditation used by the Subcommittee on Accreditation are:

A: Fully compliant with the Paris Principles.

B: Partially compliant with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination.

*A(R): The category of accreditation with reserve, previously granted where insufficient documentation had been submitted to allow for the conferral of “A” status, is no longer awarded. It is now only used when referring to institutions that were accredited with this status before April 2008.

“A” status institutions (80)

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Asia and the Pacific		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	A	October 2007 – A*
		November 2008
		November 2013 – deferred to October 2014
		October 2014
Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission	A	October 2019
		1999
		October 2006
		May 2011
India: National Human Rights Commission	A	November 2016
		1999
		October 2006
		May 2011 – A*
Indonesia: National Commission on Human Rights	A	November 2016 – deferred to November 2017
		November 2017
		2000
		March 2007
		March 2012*
		November 2013 – Special Review in March 2014
		March 2014 – A*
		March 2017

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Jordan: National Centre for Human Rights	A	April 2006 (B) March 2007 (B) October 2007 – A* October 2010 – A November 2015 – deferred to November 2016 November 2016
Malaysia: Human Rights Commission	A	2002 April 2008 – recommended to be accredited B November 2009 – A* October 2010 November 2015
Mongolia: National Human Rights Commission	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014
Nepal: National Human Rights Commission	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A April 2006 – deferred to October 2006 October 2006 – deferred to March 2007 March 2007 – deferred to October 2007 October 2007 – A* November 2008 – A* November 2009 – deferred to March 2010 March 2010 – recommended to be accredited B May 2011 – A November 2012 – Special Review in May 2013 May 2013 – deferred to November 2013 November 2013 – deferred to March 2014 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – A March 2019
New Zealand: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011 May 2016

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
The Philippines: Commission on Human Rights	A	1999 March 2007 – deferred to October 2007 October 2007 March 2012 March 2017
Qatar: National Human Rights Committee	A	October 2006 (B) March 2009 – A* March 2010 – deferred to October 2010 October 2010 November 2015
Republic of Korea: National Human Rights Commission	A	2004 November 2008 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – deferred to May 2016 May 2016
Samoa: Office of the Ombudsman	A	May 2016
Sri Lanka: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 – B October 2007 – B March 2009 – B May 2018
State of Palestine: Independent Commission for Human Rights		2005 – A(R) March 2009 November 2015
Timor-Leste: <i>Provedoria</i> for Human Rights and Justice	A	April 2008 November 2013 October 2018
Africa		
Cameroon: National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms	A	1999 October 2006 (B) March 2010 – A March 2015 – deferred to May 2016 May 2016 – deferred to November 2016 November 2016 – deferred to March 2017 March 2017 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017
Democratic Republic of Congo: National Human Rights Commission	A	May 2018 – A

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Egypt: National Council for Human Rights	A	April 2006 (B) October 2006 – A October 2011 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – deferred to November 2013 November 2013 – deferred November 2015 – deferred to November 2016 November 2016 – deferred to March 2017 March 2017 – deferred to May 2018 May 2018
Ghana: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice	A	2001 November 2008 March 2014 March 2019
Kenya: National Commission on Human Rights	A	2005 November 2008 October 2014 October 2019
Liberia: Independent National Commission on Human Rights	A	March 2017
Madagascar: <i>Commission Nationale Indépendante des Droits de l'Homme</i>	A	March 2019
Malawi: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 March 2007 March 2012 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – deferred to November 2013 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – deferred to May 2016 May 2016 – deferred to November 2016 November 2016
Mauritius: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	A	2002 April 2008 – A* October 2014

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Morocco: <i>Conseil national des droits de l'homme</i>	A	1999 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 – A* October 2010 – A* November 2015
Namibia: Office of the Ombudsman	A	2003 – A(R) April 2006 May 2011 November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 October 2018
Niger: <i>Commission Nationale des Droits Humains</i>	A	March 2017
Nigeria: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2006 October 2007 – B May 2011 – A November 2016
Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – recommended to be accredited B May 2013 – A October 2018
Sierra Leone: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2011 May 2016
South Africa: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012 November 2017
Tanzania: Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011 – A* November 2016 – deferred November 2017 November 2017

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Togo: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 October 2019
Uganda: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 April 2008 May 2013 May 2018
Zambia: Human Rights Commission	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011 November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 October 2018
Zimbabwe: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2016
Americas		
Argentina: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011 November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 October 2018 – deferred to October 2019 October 2019 – deferred
Bolivia: <i>Defensor del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 (B) 2000 – A March 2007 March 2012 March 2017
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011 May 2016
Chile: <i>Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos</i>	A	November 2012 May 2018 – Special review in October 2018 October 2018 – A

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Colombia: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – A* March 2017
Costa Rica: <i>Defensoría de los Habitantes</i>	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011 November 2016
Ecuador: <i>Defensor del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 – recommended to be accredited B March 2009 – A March 2015 May 2018 – Special Review in October 2018 October 2018 – deferred to October 2019 October 2019 – A
El Salvador: <i>Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	April 2006 May 2011 November 2016
Guatemala: <i>Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	1999 (B) 2000 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 May 2013 May 2018
Haiti: Office for the Protection of Citizens	A	November 2013 March 2019
Honduras: <i>Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	2000 October 2007 (A) October 2010 – Special Review, recommended to be accredited B October 2011 – B May 2016 – B October 2019 – A
Mexico: <i>Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011 November 2016

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Panama: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 October 2006 November 2012 November 2017 October 2019 – deferred to first session of 2020
Peru: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 March 2007 March 2012 March 2017
Uruguay: <i>Institución Nacional de Derechos Humanos y Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	May 2016
Europe		
Albania: People’s Advocate	A	2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014
Armenia: Human Rights Defender	A	April 2006 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 March 2019
Bosnia and Herzegovina: Institute of Human Rights Ombudsmen	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – recommended to be accredited B October 2010 – A November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017
Bulgaria: The Ombudsman of the Republic of Bulgaria	A	March 2019
Croatia: Ombudsman	A	April 2008 May 2013 March 2019

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Denmark: Danish Institute for Human Rights	A	1999 (B) 2001 October 2007 – A November 2012 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 October 2018
Finland: Finnish National Human Rights Institution	A	October 2014 October 2019
France: <i>Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme</i>	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 March 2019
Georgia: Public Defender's Office	A	October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 October 2018
Germany: German Institute for Human Rights	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 March 2015 – deferred to November 2015 November 2015
Greece: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 – A* November 2009 – A* March 2010 – A* March 2015 – deferred to May 2016 May 2016 – recommended to be downgraded to B March 2017 – A
Hungary: Commissioner for Fundamental Rights	A	November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 October 2019 – deferred to October 2020
Ireland: Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission	A	November 2015
Latvia: Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia	A	March 2015

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Lithuania: Seimas Ombudsmen Office	A	March 2017
Luxembourg: <i>Commission consultative des droits de l'homme</i>	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 November 2008 – recommended to be downgraded to B March 2009 – deferred to November 2009 November 2009 – A* October 2010 November 2015
Moldova: The Office of the People's Advocate of Moldova	A	November 2009 – B May 2018
The Netherlands: Netherlands Institute for Human Rights	A	March 2014
Norway: Norwegian National Human Rights Institution	A	March 2017
Poland: The Commissioner for Human Rights	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012 November 2017
Portugal: <i>Provedor de Justiça</i>	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012 November 2017
Russian Federation: Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation	A	2000 (B) 2001 (B) November 2008 – A November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 October 2019 – deferred to October 2020
Serbia: Protector of Citizens	A	March 2010 March 2015
Spain: <i>El Defensor del Pueblo</i>	A	2000 October 2007 November 2012 May 2018

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Ukraine: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights	A	April 2008 (B) March 2009 – A March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 October 2019
Great Britain: Equality and Human Rights Commission	A	November 2008 October 2010 – Special Review – A November 2015
Northern Ireland (UK): Human Rights Commission	A	2001 (B) May 2011 – A May 2016
Scotland: Scottish Human Rights Commission	A	November 2009 – deferred to March 2010 March 2010 March 2015

“B” status institutions (34)

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Americas		
Nicaragua: <i>Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos</i>	B	April 2006 – A May 2011 – A November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to May 2018 May 2018 – recommended to be downgraded B status March 2019 – B
Paraguay: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo de Paraguay</i>	B	March 2019
Venezuela: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	B	2002 – A April 2008 – A May 2013 – A March 2014 – Special Review in October 2014 October 2014 – deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – recommended to be accredited B May 2016 – B
Asia and the Pacific		
Bahrain: National Institution for Human Rights	B	May 2016
Bangladesh: National Human Rights Commission	B	May 2011 March 2015

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Iraq: High Commission for Human Rights	B	March 2015
Maldives: Human Rights Commission	B	April 2008 March 2010
Myanmar: Myanmar National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2015
Oman: National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Thailand: National Human Rights Commission	B	2004 – A November 2008 – A November 2013 – deferred to March 2014 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – recommended to be downgraded to B November 2015 – B
Central Asia		
Kazakhstan: The Commissioner for Human Rights	B	March 2012
Kyrgyzstan: The Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Tajikistan: The Human Rights Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Africa		
Algeria: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A April 2008 – recommended to be downgraded to B March 2009 – B March 2010 – deferred to October 2010 October 2010 May 2018
Burundi: <i>Commission nationale indépendante des droits de l'homme</i>	B	November 2012 – A May 2016 – Special Review in November 2016 November 2016 – recommended to be downgraded to B November 2017 – B
Chad: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	2000 – A(R) 2001 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – B
Congo: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	October 2010

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Côte d'Ivoire: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	May 2016
Libya: National Council for Civil Liberties and Human Rights	B	October 2014
Mali: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	March 2012
Mauritania: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	November 2009 (B) May 2011 – A November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – recommended to be downgraded to B October 2018 – B
Senegal: <i>Comité sénégalais des droits de l'homme</i>	B	2000 October 2007 – A* October 2010 – deferred to May 2011 May 2011 – deferred to October 2011 October 2011 – recommended to be accredited B November 2012 – B
Tunisia: <i>Comité supérieur des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales</i>	B	November 2009
Ethiopia: Ethiopian Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Europe		
Austria: The Austrian Ombudsman Board	B	2000 May 2011
Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)	B	October 2006 – A October 2010 – deferred to May 2011 May 2011 – recommended to be accredited B March 2012 – A March 2017 – recommended to be downgraded to B May 2018 – B
Belgium: The Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunity and fight against racism and discrimination	B	May 2018
Bulgaria: Commission for Protection Against Discrimination	B	October 2011
Cyprus: Commissioner for Administration and Human Rights	B	November 2015

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
North Macedonia: The Ombudsman	B	October 2011
Montenegro: Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms	B	May 2016
Slovakia: National Centre for Human Rights	B	2002 – C October 2007 March 2012 – Accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation March 2014 – B
Slovenia: Human Rights Ombudsman	B	2000 March 2010
Sweden: Equality Ombudsman	B	May 2011

“C” status institutions (10)

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Africa		
Benin: <i>Commission béninoise des droits de l’homme</i>	C	2002
Madagascar: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l’homme</i>	C	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) April 2006 – recommended status withdrawn October 2006 – C
Americas		
Antigua and Barbuda: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Barbados: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Puerto Rico: <i>Oficina del Procurador del Ciudadano del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico</i>	C	March 2007
Asia and the Pacific		
Hong Kong, China: Equal Opportunities Commission	C	2000
Iran: <i>Commission islamique des droits de l’homme</i>	C	2000
Europe		
Romania: Romanian Institute for Human Rights	C	March 2007 May 2011

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Switzerland: <i>Commission fédérale pour les questions féminines</i>	C	March 2009
Switzerland: Federal Commission against Racism	C	1998 (B) March 2010

Suspended institutions

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Asia and the Pacific		
Fiji: Human Rights Commission	Suspended	2000 (A) March 2007 – accreditation suspended; documents to be submitted October 2007 2 April 2007 – The Commission resigned from the former International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on 2 April 2007.
Americas		
Paraguay: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	Suspended	2003 – A November 2008 – A November 2013 – deferred to March 2014 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – March 2019 – Suspended

Institutions whose accreditation has lapsed

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Africa		
Burkina Faso: <i>Commission nationale des droits humains</i>		2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2005 – B March 2012 – accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation
Europe		
Norway: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights		In view of the establishment of Norwegian National Human Rights Institution and its accreditation in March 2017, the accreditation of this institution lapsed.

Dissolved institutions

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Europe		
Hungary: Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights		May 2011 The institution ceased to exist in view of establishment of a new institution – Commissioner for Fundamental Rights.
The Netherlands: Equal Treatment Commission		1999 – B 2004 – B March 2010 – B The institution ceased to exist in view of establishment of new institution – The Netherlands Institute for Human Rights.
Ireland: Irish Human Rights Commission		November 2014 The institution was dissolved by Act 2014, which established the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission.
Belgium: The Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism		December 2014 The institution had been transformed into two institutions: The Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Discrimination and Racism; The Federal Centre for the Analysis of Migration Flows.
